



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/853,976	05/10/2001	Anna M. Zara	10007988	8110

7590 10/21/2003

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

ZEENDER, FLORIAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 10/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/853,976

Applicant(s)

ZARA ET AL.

Examiner

F. Ryan Zeender

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 August 2003 and 08 April 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 32-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 45-58 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 32-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 10 May 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, claims 32-44, in Paper No. 5 is acknowledged. Claims 45-58 have been withdrawn as being directed to a non-elected invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 32-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Groat et al. '884.

Groat et al. '884 disclose or inherently teach all of the limitations of the claims (see specifically paragraphs [0040]-[0043]) except the specific teaching of: the purchase order being generated from an asset template; and sending scanned information to an order processing center and a data center management system; and correlating the purchased component with a purchase order.

It would have been an obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to generate purchase orders for components using various types of templates (i.e., EXCEL spreadsheets) and correlating the order with an underlying purchase order record as this type of action is well known in the art of business supply management in order to accurately track what has been ordered and what has been received from the supplier/vendor. It would have been a further obvious design choice to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Groat et al. to send scanned information to various departments/centers of a

Art Unit: 3627

manufacturing facility, in order that all personnel working at the facility can have access to the information, as is well known in network systems.

Re claim 34: Various types of information contained in the code regarding the asset would have been an obvious design choice in order to provide whatever data is desired.

Re claims 37-38: It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to review the received purchased component (for example "pump" 302 in Groat et al.) to ensure that the component is sufficient for an asset (for example "refrigerator" 308 in Groat et al.) to be assembled in order that the asset performs properly.

Re claims 39-43: These are all steps taken by manufacturers that are well known in the management of assets in order to track goods able to be shipped and goods that may need additional work.

Claim 44 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Groat et al. '884 in view of DeWolf et al. '626.

Groat et al. '884 lack the specific teaching of updating the state of the asset.

De Wolf et al. teach a similar asset management system whereby the status of the asset is continuously updated. For example, in paragraph [0038], the ownership of the asset is updated. The asset is "deployable" in that the seller sets the ownership of the asset to the buyer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Groat et al. to include a means for updating the state of the asset to

"deployable", in view of DeWolf et al., in order for the manufacturer to know when the asset is complete and ready to move to the next place in the supply chain.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 7/11/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Groat et al. "does not disclose a method of automatically recording a configuration of a purchased data center component". However, the claims, as presently written, do not mention **automatically recording** anything, but, instead claim: scanning a machine-readable code, then sending the scanned information, and correlating the purchased component with a purchase order for the component. These features being obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of Groat et al.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any


Art Unit: 3627

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to F. Ryan Zeender whose telephone number is (703) 308-8351. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bob Olszewski can be reached on (703) 308-5183. The receptionist's phone number for the Technology center is (703) 308-1113.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9326 for before Final communications and (703) 872-9327 for after Final communications.

 10/17/03

F. Zeender
Patent Examiner, A.U. 3627
October 17, 2003